arXiv:1604.05787v3 [math.PR] 23 Feb 2017

ON DENSITIES FOR SOLUTIONS TO STOCHASTIC FIXED POINT EQUATIONS

KEVIN LECKEY
SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
MONASH UNIVERSITY
MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA

EMAIL: KEVIN.LECKEY@MONASH.EDU

Abstract. We consider systems of stochastic fixed point equations that arise in the asymptotic analysis of random recursive structures and algorithms such as Quicksort, generalized Pólya urn processes, and path lengths of random recursive trees and split trees. The main result states sufficient condition on the fixed point equations that imply the existence of bounded, smooth, rapidly decreasing Lebesgue densities.

MSC2010: Primary 60E05, 60E10; secondary 60G30, 60F05, 68Q87.
Keywords: *stochastic fixed point equation; probability density function; Schwartz space; Pólya urn; split tree.*

1. Introduction

The contraction method is an approach to derive limit theorems for a broad class of random recursive structures and algorithms. It was introduced by Rösler [39] in 1991 for the distributional analysis of the complexity of Quicksort. Over the last 25 years this approach has been extended to a variety of random variables with underlying recursive structures. Some examples are: recursive algorithms [38, 30, 32, 36], data structures [21, 32, 33], Pólya urn models [17, 28], and random tree models [2, 20].

Limit distributions derived by the contraction method are given implicitly as solutions to stochastic fixed point equations. A stochastic fixed point equation is an equation $\mu = T(\mu)$, where $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ and $T : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ for some set $\mathcal{M}$ of probability distributions. A random variable X is called solution to the stochastic fixed point equation $\mu = T(\mu)$ if its distribution is a fixed point of T. In many cases an explicit description of such a solution (e.g. in terms of its distribution function) is unknown. In particular a lot of limits in Pólya urn models are not known explicitly and thus any further properties of these limits need to be derived from their stochastic fixed point equations.

The aim of this paper is a better understanding of solutions to stochastic fixed point equations. We will discuss several examples in which the fixed point equation implies that the limit distribution is 'smooth' in the sense that it has an infinitely differentiable, rapidly decreasing Lebesgue density.

The stochastic fixed point equations in this paper are of the following type: Let $X_1, \dots, X_m$ be $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables for some $m \geq 1$ and $d \geq 1$. The distributions

of $X_1, \dots, X_m$ are given implicitly as solutions to

$$X_r \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_{r,j} X^{(j)}_{\ell_r(j)} + b_r, \quad r \in [m], \tag{1}$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution, and:

- $\ell_r : \mathbb{N} \to [m]$ is some given function;
- $X^{(j)}_{\ell_r(j)}$ has the same distribution as $X_{\ell_r(j)}$;
- $A_{r,j}$ is a random $d \times d$ matrix and b_r is a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable;
- $X^{(1)}_{\ell_r(1)}, X^{(2)}_{\ell_r(2)}, \dots$ and $((A_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}, b_r)$ are independent.

The main result (Theorem 4.2) states sufficient conditions on $((A_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}, b_r)$ for the existence of bounded (Lebesgue-) densities for the distributions of $X_1, \dots, X_m$. These densities are shown to be smooth (i.e. all derivatives exist). Moreover, they are Schwartz functions if all moments of $X_1, \dots, X_m$ are finite (f is a Schwartz function if $f(t)$ and all its derivatives decay faster than any polynomial in $\|t\|^{-1}$).

Equations of type (1) appear in a variety of limit theorems such as the examples listed below; see Section 3 for proper definitions and more details.

- **Branching processes.** Limit distributions in several branching processes [23] can be characterized by an equation of type (1) with:

$$m = 1, \quad d = 1, \quad (A_{1,j})_{j\geq 1} = (A'_{1,j} \mathbf{1}_{\{N \geq j\}})_{j \geq 1}, \quad b_1 = 0,$$

where $(N, A'_{1,1}, A'_{1,2}, \dots)$ is a random variable in $\mathbb{N}_0 \times (0,\infty) \times (0,\infty) \times \dots$

In a supercritical Galton Watson process $(Z_n)_{n\geq 0}$, for example, let N be the offspring distribution and $\mu = \mathbb{E}[N]$. Then $(Z_n/\mu^n)_{n\geq 0}$ converges to a limit that solves this kind of distributional equation with $A'_{1,j} = 1/\mu$. Note that the limit distribution has an atom in 0 unless $\mathbb{P}(N = 0) = 0$. Hence it cannot be absolutely continuous on its entire support.

If $\mathbb{P}(N = 0) = 0$, then Liu [23] states sufficient conditions on $(N, A'_{1,1}, A'_{1,2}, \dots)$ for the existence of a density for X_1. We extend this approach to obtain similar results for the general equation (1) (see Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.5). Although these result are insufficient to obtain smooth densities for the other examples listed below, they provide a basis for inductively gaining better bounds on the characteristic functions of $X_1, \dots, X_m$. These bounds finally lead to a result (Theorem 4.2) that implies the existence of infinitely differentiable densities for all examples below.

We will not discuss branching processes in this paper although it improves Liu's result [23, Corollary (Absolute continuity I)] in some situations where the largest element among $\{|A'_{1,1}|, \dots, |A'_{1,N}|\}$ is bounded from below but

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{N} |A'_{1,j}|^{-b}\right] = \infty \quad \text{for some } b > 0. \tag{2}$$

Note that with (2) Liu's result may still yield the existence of a density f, but cannot ensure that the a-th derivative of f exists for $a > b$. The result in this

paper uses a different approach that yields the existence of all derivatives of f (under conditions introduced in Definition 4.1).

- **Quicksort.** The Quicksort limit X [39] satisfies an equation of type (1) with

$$m = 1, \quad d = 1, \quad (A_{1,j})_{j\geq 1} = (U, 1-U, 0, \ldots), \quad b_1 = g(U),$$

where U is uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$ and $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is some function. Based on this equation Fill and Janson [9] show that X has a density which is a Schwartz function. Parts of the proofs in Section 5 (Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.7) are largely inspired by the work of Fill and Janson.

  Note that the joint distribution of key comparisons and key exchanges in Quicksort also converges to a limit that can be described by an equation of type (1) (see [30]). Theorem 4.2 yields that this joint limit (as a random variable in $\mathbb{R}^2$) has an infinitely differentiable density. To the best of this author's knowledge this is the first result on densities for solutions to (1) in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \geq 2$.

- **Pólya urns.** Consider a Pólya urn with q colors and some replacement rule $R = (\xi_{i,j})_{i,j\in[q]} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{q\times q}$ (cf. Section 3 for details). A lot of replacement rules are known to lead to non-normal limit laws; see Janson [13]. Usually limit distributions in this context can be characterized by equations of type (1); see [17] for some examples. In particular these equations involve $m \geq 2$ different limit distributions and thus are not covered by results like Liu's paper [23].

  It is known that in the case of two colors these limits have smooth densities [3]. For more than two colors, similar arguments show that at least the projections of the limits to the eigenspaces of R have densities [26]. Theorem 4.2 provides a general framework for these examples (and others such as random replacement rules) and yields the existence of infinitely differentiable density functions for the limits.

- **Path length of random trees.** The (total) path lengths of several random trees, in particular the class of random split trees [4], converge to limits that can be described by equations like (1). To the best of this author's knowledge the limit distribution in split trees has not been analyzed regarding absolute continuity. Under some mild assumption on the split vector (which are fulfilled in all examples given by Devroye [4]) Theorem 4.2 yields that these limits have infinitely differentiable densities.

  Another advantage of the general setting in (1) is that it also covers multivariate limits: The joint distribution of path length and Wiener index in a split tree converges to a limit distribution [29] given by an equation of type (1) (in $\mathbb{R}^2$). Again Theorem 4.2 implies that the limit distribution has an infinitely differentiable density (in $\mathbb{R}^2$).

To wrap up the advantages of this paper: One of the main advantages is the generality of the framework. Aside from Liu's result [23], all known results listed above are derived for an explicit type of $(A_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}$, that is either a beta- or a Dirichlet-distribution. This paper does not require such restrictive assumptions on $(A_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}$. Another advantage is that, despite its generality, the result is as powerful as the corresponding one for Quicksort [9], which in many examples beats the approach by Liu. Moreover, it covers systems of fixed point equations ($m \geq 2$), which arise, e.g., in Pólya urns. Furthermore

it is the first result on fixed point equations for random variables in higher dimensions ($d \geq 2$) that arise in multivariate limit laws. Finally the conditions for the main result (see Definition 4.1 in Section 4) are easy to verify (in particular for $d = 1$). Hence it is not hard to apply the result to other fixed point equations that arise in the contraction method.

The main motivation for this paper is the following: The contraction method deals with distances in a rather abstract metric, often in the so-called the Wasserstein metric ℓ_p (cf., e.g., [39]). Usually it is not hard to extract a rate of convergence in this abstract metric, that is an upper bounds on $\ell_p(Y_n, Y)$ for a sequence $(Y_n)_{n\geq 1}$ that converges to Y. Now suppose Y_n and Y are real valued and let F_n denote the distributional function of Y_n and let F denote the distributional function of Y. Assume that Y admits a bounded density f_Y. Then

$$\|F_n - F\|_\infty \leq ((p+1)\|f_Y\|_\infty^p)^{\frac{1}{1+p}} \left(\ell_p(Y_n, Y)\right)^{\frac{p}{1+p}}, \qquad p \geq 1.$$

Thus, the existence of a density for Y is crucial to transfer a rate of convergence of $(\ell_p(Y_n, Y))_{n\geq 1}$ to an upper bound on $(\|F_n - F\|_\infty)_{n\geq 1}$.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some basic notation and definitions. In particular, Schwartz functions are defined in that section. Section 3 introduces several examples to motivate the type of stochastic fixed point equation considered in the later sections. These examples are Quicksort, Pólya urn models, and path lengths in several random tree models. Section 3 also contains the results on these examples that follow from the main theorem in Section 4. Aside from the main result (Theorem 4.2), Section 4 contains all results proven to deduce Theorem 4.2. Some of these results are still applicable even if the conditions in Theorem 4.2 are violated. The end of Section 4 summarizes how to apply Theorem 4.2 to the examples introduced in Section 3. Full proofs are given in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 contains some further directions for the analysis of stochastic fixed point equations.

2. Preliminaries and Notation

Throughout this paper let d be a positive integer. Let $\mathbb{R}^d$ be endowed with the standard inner product $\langle x, y\rangle$ and Euclidean norm $\|x\|$ of vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The operator norm of a matrix A is denoted by $\|A\|_{\mathrm{op}}$. Let $\mathfrak{Re}(z)$ and $\mathfrak{Im}(z)$ denote real- and imaginary part of a complex number z. Complex numbers are embedded into $\mathbb{R}^2$ as usual, that is $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is identified with the vector $(\mathfrak{Re}(z), \mathfrak{Im}(z)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In particular, $\langle z_1, z_2\rangle := \mathfrak{Re}(z_1)\mathfrak{Re}(z_2) + \mathfrak{Im}(z_1)\mathfrak{Im}(z_2)$ for $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$.

Notation. Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of all positive integers and let $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Let $[m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$ for a positive integer m. Let $a \wedge b := \min(a, b)$ and $a \vee b := \max(a, b)$ for real numbers a and b. Let $\mathcal{L}(X)$ denote the distribution of a random variable X.

For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and a vector $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ let

$$D^\beta f := \frac{\partial^{\beta_1}}{\partial x_1^{\beta_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\beta_d}}{\partial x_d^{\beta_d}} f.$$

A function f is called n-times continuously differentiable if $D^\beta f$ exists and is continuous for all β with $\sum_j \beta_j \leq n$. Let $\mathcal{C}^n(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the set of all n-times continuously differentiable functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) := \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}^n(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Definition 2.1. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a *Schwartz function* if

$$(i)\ f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \qquad (ii)\ \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \|x\|^\alpha \left| D^\beta f(x) \right| \right\} < \infty \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d.$$

Moreover, a function $g : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a *Schwartz function* if the function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto g(x_1 + ix_2)$, is a Schwartz function.

Definition 2.2. A probability distribution μ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ has a *Schwartz density* if and only if there is a Schwartz function f such that f is a density of μ. An $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable X *admits a Schwartz density* if and only if $\mathcal{L}(X)$ has a Schwartz density.

Definition 2.3. $\mathrm{Supp}(X)$ denotes the support of a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable X, i.e.

$$\mathrm{Supp}(X) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbb{P}(\|X - x\| > \varepsilon) > 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0\}.$$

$\mathrm{Supp}(X)$ is in *general position* if there are $x_0, \ldots, x_d \in \mathrm{Supp}(X)$ such that

$$x_1 - x_0, x_2 - x_0, \ldots, x_d - x_0 \text{ are linearly independent in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

For $d = 1$, $\mathrm{Supp}(X)$ is in general position if and only if $\mathbb{P}(X = c) < 1$ for all $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

3. Motivation and Examples

This section contains examples of limits given by stochastic fixed point equations. These example are given as a motivation for the results in the next section. Note that the term *Schwartz density* from Definition 2.2 appears in several results below.

1. Quicksort. The *Quicksort* algorithm was introduced by Hoare [11] in 1962. This algorithms sorts a list by choosing a *pivot* element among its elements and subdividing the list into two parts: one containing the elements smaller than the pivot, the other containing the elements larger than the pivot. The algorithm then is recursively applied to both parts. If the *pivot* is chosen uniformly at random in the list (or if the input is considered to be random), the total number of key comparisons, properly rescaled, converges to some limit X almost surely as the number of keys tends to infinity. This convergence was first proven with martingale techniques [37] without specifying the limit X. With Rösler's contraction method the distribution of X can be characterized as a solution to the following stochastic fixed point equation [39]:

$$X \stackrel{d}{=} UX^{(1)} + (1-U)X^{(2)} + g(U), \tag{3}$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ denotes that both sides have the same distribution; $X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}$ and U are independent; $X^{(0)}$ and $X^{(1)}$ have the same distribution as X; U is uniformly distributed on $(0, 1)$; and $g(u) := 2u \log u + 2(1-u)\log(1-u) + 1$.

Based on this distributional equation, Fill and Janson show that X admits a Schwartz density [9, Theorem 3.1]. The main features of (3) which will reappear in the conditions for the main result are the following:

- The limit distribution X appears at least twice on the right-hand side of (3) with factors U and $1-U$ that are non-zero (almost surely),
- The largest factor $\max(U, 1-U)$ is bounded from above (by 1) and from below by a positive constant (here $1/2$),
- The second largest factor (in this case smallest factor) $\min(U, 1-U)$ has at least a polynomial tail decay at zero, here $\mathbb{P}(\min(U, 1-U) \leq x) = 2x$ for $x \to 0$.

The main theorem in the next section (Theorem 4.2) yields that the random variable X in (3) admits a Schwartz density. This is not a new result [9, Theorem 3.1], but it can be extended to a bivariate limit:

The joint distribution of key comparisons and key exchanges performed by Quicksort also converges to a limit (X, Y) that can be described by the following stochastic fixed point equation [30]:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{d}{=} \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X^{(1)} \\ Y^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1-U & 0 \\ 0 & 1-U \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X^{(2)} \\ Y^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} + g_2(U) \tag{4}$$

where $(X^{(1)}, Y^{(1)}), (X^{(2)}, Y^{(2)})$ and U are independent; $(X^{(j)}, Y^{(j)})$ has the same distribution as (X, Y); U is uniformly distributed on $(0, 1)$; and

$$g_2(U) := (2U \log U + 2(1-U)\log(1-U)) \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 1/3 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ U(1-U) \end{pmatrix}.$$

To the best of this author's knowledge, the resulting limit (X, Y) has not been studied so far. Theorem 4.2 yields the following:

Theorem 3.1. *Let (X, Y) be a solution to (4). Then (X, Y) admits a bounded density $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$.*

Remark 3.2. *Theorem 4.2 also yields that the density f above is a Schwartz function if $\mathbb{E}[|X|^p] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[|Y|^p] < \infty$ for all $p \geq 1$. X is known to have a finite moment generating function, but a corresponding result for Y has not be proven yet. We leave it as an open problem whether all moments of Y are finite.*

2. Pólya Urns. Consider an urn process with balls of q different colors labeled $1, \ldots, q$. The process evolves in discrete time. Let $X_{n,j}$ denote the number of balls of color j in the urn at time step n. Given an initial composition $(X_{0,1}, \ldots, X_{0,q})$ with at least one ball and a replacement matrix $(\xi_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\ldots,q}$ (each of them can be deterministic or random) the urn evolves in time as follows. Let $X_n = (X_{n,1}, \ldots, X_{n,q})$ be the current composition of balls in the urn. Draw a ball form the urn uniformly at random and denote its color by I. Then $X_{n+1} := X_n + (\xi'_{I,1}, \ldots, \xi'_{I,q})$ where $(\xi'_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\ldots,q}$ is an independent copy of the replacement matrix $(\xi_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\ldots,q}$ (and also independent from X_n). A replacement rule is called random, if $(\xi_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\ldots,q}$ has a non-degenerate distribution, and deterministic otherwise.

The literature on Pólya urns is vast. We mainly focus on the results by Knape and Neininger [17], since their limit laws are based on the contraction method and thus are determined by stochastic fixed point equations. For more information on Pólya urns see the monographs of Johnson and Kotz [15], Mahmoud [25], the papers of Janson [13], Flajolet, Gabarró and Pekari [10], and Pouyanne [35], as well as the references therein.

2.1. Urns with Two Colors and Deterministic Replacement. Consider a Pólya urn with 2 colors and replacement rule (cf. [17, Section 6.1])

$$(\xi_{i,j})_{i,j\in\{1,2\}} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

with constants $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Assume $a + b = c + d$ and $bc > 0$. Let $K := a + b + 1$ and $\lambda := (a - c)/(a + b)$. Let $(X_n^{[1]})_{n\geq 0}$ denote the urn process with that replacement rule and initial configuration $X_0^{[1]} = (1, 0)$. Similarly, let $(X_n^{[2]})_{n\geq 0}$ be the process with initial configuration $X_0^{[2]} = (0, 1)$. Then, if $\lambda > 1/2$, [17, Theorem 6.1]

$$\frac{X_{n,1}^{[1]} - \mathbb{E}[X_{n,1}^{[1]}]}{n^\lambda} \xrightarrow{d} X_1, \qquad \frac{X_{n,1}^{[2]} - \mathbb{E}[X_{n,1}^{[2]}]}{n^\lambda} \xrightarrow{d} X_2. \tag{5}$$

The distributions of X_1 and X_2 are the unique pair of distributions with $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \mathbb{E}[X_2] = 0$, finite variance, and

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &\stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{a+1} D_j^\lambda X_1^{(j)} + \sum_{j=a+2}^{K} D_j^\lambda X_2^{(j)} + b_1(\mathbf{D}), \\ X_2 &\stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{c} D_j^\lambda X_1^{(j)} + \sum_{j=c+1}^{K} D_j^\lambda X_2^{(j)} + b_2(\mathbf{D}) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where

- $X_1^{(1)}, \dots X_1^{(K)}, X_2^{(1)}, \dots, X_2^{(K)}$ and $\mathbf{D} := (D_1, \dots, D_K)$ are independent;
- $X_i^{(j)} \stackrel{d}{=} X_i$ for all i, j;
- $\mathbf{D}$ has the Dirichlet $\left(\frac{1}{K-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{K-1}\right)$ distribution;
- b_1 and b_2 are some deterministic function with $\mathbb{P}(b_j(\mathbf{D}) \neq 0) > 0$ (the explicit functions can be found in [17, Theorem 6.1]).

Chauvin, Mailler and Pouyanne [3] analyze the limit distributions X_1 and X_2 in (5) regarding absolute continuity and finiteness of moments. In particular, they show that X_1 and X_2 admit a bounded, continuous densities. Theorem 4.2 yields the following:

Theorem 3.3. *The limits X_1 and X_2 in (5) admit Schwartz densities.*

2.2. A Random Replacement Urn. Consider a Pólya urn with 2 colors and replacement rule (cf. [17, Section 6.2])

$$(\xi_{i,j})_{i,j\in\{1,2\}} = \begin{pmatrix} F_{p_1} & 1 - F_{p_1} \\ 1 - F_{p_2} & F_{p_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathbb{P}(F_x = 1) = x = 1 - \mathbb{P}(F_x = 0)$ for $x \in \{p_1, p_2\}$. Let $(X_n^{[1]})_{n\geq 0}$ denote the urn process with that replacement rule and initial configuration $X_0^{[1]} = (1, 0)$. Similarly, let $(X_n^{[2]})_{n\geq 0}$ be the process with initial configuration $X_0^{[2]} = (0, 1)$. Finally, let $\lambda = p_1 + p_2 - 1$. Then, if $1/2 < \lambda < 1$, [17, Theorem 6.4]

$$\frac{X_{n,1}^{[1]} - \mathbb{E}\left[X_{n,1}^{[1]}\right]}{n^\lambda} \xrightarrow{d} X_1, \qquad \frac{X_{n,1}^{[2]} - \mathbb{E}\left[X_{n,1}^{[2]}\right]}{n^\lambda} \xrightarrow{d} X_2 \tag{7}$$

with limiting distributions that can be characterized as the unique pair of distributions having finite second moments, $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \mathbb{E}[X_2] = 0$, and satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &\stackrel{d}{=} U^\lambda X_1^{(1)} + F_{p_1}(1-U)^\lambda X_1^{(2)} + (1-F_{p_1})(1-U)^\lambda X_2 + b_1'(U, F_{p_1}), \\ X_2 &\stackrel{d}{=} U^\lambda X_2^{(1)} + F_{p_2}(1-U)^\lambda X_2^{(2)} + (1-F_{p_2})(1-U)^\lambda X_1 + b_2'(U, F_{p_2}), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where

- $X_1, X_2, X_1^{(1)}, X_1^{(2)}, X_2^{(1)}, X_2^{(2)}, F_{p_1}, F_{p_2}$ and U are independent;
- $X_i^{(j)} \stackrel{d}{=} X_i$ for all i, j;
- U is uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$;
- b_1' and b_2' are some deterministic functions with $\mathbb{P}(b_j'(U, F_{p_j}) \neq 0) > 0$ (the explicit functions can be found in [17, Theorem 6.4])

To the best of this author's knowledge the distributions of X_1 and X_2 have not been studied in the literature. Theorem 4.2 yields the following:

Theorem 3.4. *The limits X_1 and X_2 in (7) admit bounded densities $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.*

Note that f_1 and f_2 above are Schwartz functions if $\mathbb{E}[|X_1|^p]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|X_2|^p]$ are both finite for every $p > 0$ (see Theorem 4.2). Checking finiteness of moments will not be done in this paper, although it most likely holds, e.g., by a generalization of the methods of Rösler [40, Theorem 6].

2.3. Cyclic Urns. Consider a Pólya urn with $q \geq 2$ colors and replacement rule $(\xi_{k,j})_{k,j=1,\dots,q}$ given by (cf. [17, Section 6.3])

$$\xi_{k,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = k+1 \text{ or } (k,j) = (q,1) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ denote the urn process with that replacement rule initialized with a single ball of color 1, i.e. $X_{0,1} = 1$ and $X_{0,k} = 0$ for $k \geq 2$.

Properly rescaled, $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ converges in distribution to a gaussian vector when $q \leq 6$ colors are considered (cf. [12] and [13, Example 7.9]). For $q \geq 7$ the limit behavior changes as follows: Let i denote the imaginary unit, $\omega = \exp(2\pi i/q)$, and

$$\lambda = \mathfrak{Re}(\omega) = \cos(2\pi/q), \quad \mu = \mathfrak{Im}(\omega) = \sin(2\pi/q), \quad v = \left(1, \omega^{-1}, \omega^{-2}, \dots, \omega^{-(q-1)}\right).$$

Let $\mathbf{1} := (1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Then, as $n \to \infty$,

$$\frac{X_n - \frac{n}{q}\mathbf{1}}{n^\lambda} - 2\mathfrak{Re}(n^{i\mu} X v) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s. and in } L_p \text{ for any } p > 0 \tag{9}$$

with some $\mathbb{C}$-valued random variable X. The limit X satisfies $\mathbb{E}[X] = \frac{2}{q\Gamma(\omega+1)}$ and

$$X \stackrel{d}{=} U^\omega X^{(1)} + \omega(1-U)^\omega X^{(2)}, \tag{10}$$

with $X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}$ and U being independent; $X^{(j)} \stackrel{d}{=} X$; and U being uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$. The convergence in (9) was shown by Pouyanne [34, Theorem 4] via martingale arguments and is also covered by Janson's result [13, Theorem 3.24] (cf. also [35, Theorem

3.5] for a more general statement and convergence in L_p). Moreover, a different approach with the contraction method [17, Theorem 6.10] yields the characterization (10) for X.

In contrast to the previous examples, the random variable X in (9) is not real valued. However, (10) may be interpreted as an equation for $\mathbb{R}^2$-valued random variables, which are also covered by the result in the next section.

Mailler [26] studied the limits occurring in Pólya urns with deterministic replacement rule. This study is focused on the asymptotic behavior of $\pi_E(X_n)$, where π_E is the projection to an eigenspace E of the replacement matrix. Depending on the associated eigenvalue, the projection are either asymptotically normal or converge almost surely to some non-normal limit. It is also shown that this non-normal limit admits a density [26, Theorem 11].

The main result in the next section yields the following:

Theorem 3.5. *Let X be the $\mathbb{C}$-valued random variable in (9). Then $(\mathfrak{Re}(X), \mathfrak{Im}(X))$ admits a Schwartz density.*

Note that this has two advantages compared to Mailler's result [26, Theorem 11]: The result directly deals with X rather than limits appearing in the projection of X_n to eigenspaces, and it shows that the density is a Schwartz function.

3. Path Length in Random Trees. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a rooted tree and let $V(\mathcal{T})$ denote the vertex-set of $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, let d_v denote the distance between $v \in V(\mathcal{T})$ and the root of $\mathcal{T}$, where the distance of two vertices is defined as the number of edges in the unique path connecting them.

If $\mathcal{T}$ is a tree storing data in its vertices, the total path length can be defined in two different ways: either with respect to the data, or with respect to the vertices. The total path length of $\mathcal{T}$ with respect to its vertices is

$$\Upsilon(\mathcal{T}) := \sum_{v \in V(\mathcal{T})} d_v.$$

Now assume $\mathcal{T}$ stores data in its vertices, e.g. assume that $\mathcal{T}$ stores $n(\mathcal{T})$ numbers $u_1, \dots, u_{n(\mathcal{T})}$. Let v_j be the the vertex that contains u_j and let $d_j := d_{v_j}$. Then the total path length of $\mathcal{T}$ with respect to its data is

$$\Psi(\mathcal{T}) := \sum_{j=1}^{n(\mathcal{T})} d_j.$$

The contraction method has been applied to the total path length of a variety of random trees. We only list some random trees that are covered by our main result (Theorem 4.2). Definitions and limit laws can be found in the references:

3.1. Random Recursive Trees. Let $\mathcal{T}_n$ be a random recursive tree with n vertices (see Smythe and Mahmoud [42] for a survey on recursive trees). Then [24, 6], as $n \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\Upsilon(\mathcal{T}_n) - \mathbb{E}[\Upsilon(\mathcal{T}_n)]}{n} \longrightarrow X \quad \text{a.s. and in } L_p \text{ for any } p > 0 \tag{11}$$

where X is some non-degenerate random variable. The limit X satisfies [6]:

$$X \stackrel{d}{=} UX^{(1)} + (1-U)X^{(2)} + h(U), \tag{12}$$

where $X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}$ and U are independent; $X^{(1)}$ and $X^{(2)}$ have the same distribution as X; U is uniformly distributed on $[0,1]$; and $h(u) := u + u\log u + (1-u)\log(1-u)$.

This equation is very similar to Equation (3) for Quicksort. As already mentioned by Dobrow and Fill [6], essential the same analysis as for Quicksort show that X admits a Schwartz density. Theorem 4.2 adds a formal proof to this observation:

Theorem 3.6. *Let X be the limit in (11). Then X admits a Schwartz density.*

A slightly modified tree model with a weighted root (called a *Hoppe tree*) was defined and studied by Leckey and Neininger [20]. We do not go into detail for this variation and just point out that the limit of the total path length in Hoppe trees is also covered by Theorem 4.2.

3.2. Split Trees. Random split trees are a class of random trees introduced by Devroye [4]. The distribution of a random split tree is determined by a *branch factor* $b \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$, a *capacity* $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, a *(random) split vector* $\mathcal{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_b)$, and *ball distribution parameters* $(s_0, s_1) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$. Here, $\mathcal{V}$ is a random variable taking values in the unit simplex of $\mathbb{R}^b$. We refer to Devroye [4] for a definition of a random split tree. Let $\mathcal{T}_n$ be a random split tree storing n items. Let $X_n := \Psi(\mathcal{T}_n)$.

Let $\mu := -\mathbb{E}[V_1 \ln V_1 + \cdots + V_b \ln V_b]$ and assume $\mu \neq 0$ (i.e. $\mathbb{P}(\exists i : V_i = 1) < 1$). Let

$$C(\mathcal{V}) := 1 + \frac{1}{\mu}\sum_{j=1}^{b} V_j \ln V_j. \tag{13}$$

Based on an unproven assumption on the asymptotic expansion of the mean, Neininger and Rüschendorf [31] show

$$\frac{X_n - \mathbb{E}[X_n]}{n} \xrightarrow{d} X. \tag{14}$$

This assumption on the mean has been verified by Broutin and Holmgren [2] for split vectors with $\mathbb{P}(C(\mathcal{V}) \neq 0) > 0$ (see also Munsonius [29] for split vectors where the marginals have a Lebesgue density). The limit X then satisfies

$$X \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{b} V_j X^{(j)} + C(\mathcal{V}), \tag{15}$$

where $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(b)}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are independent; and $X^{(j)}$ has the same distribution as X.

To the best of this author's knowledge the distribution of X in (14) has not been studied in the literature. The main result in the next section yields the following:

Theorem 3.7. *Assume that the split vector $\mathcal{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_b)$ satisfies*

- $\mathbb{P}(\max_j V_j \geq 1 - x) \leq \lambda x^\nu$ *for some $\lambda, \nu > 0$ and all $x \geq 0$,*
- $\mathbb{P}(C(\mathcal{V}) \neq 0) > 0$.

Then the limit X in (14) admits a Schwartz density f.

Note that the second condition ($\mathbb{P}(C(\mathcal{V}) \neq 0) > 0$) is only required for the limit law by Broutin and Holmgrem. More generally, the first condition in the previous theorem implies that any non-degenerate solution to (15) admits a bounded density $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. If the solution has finite moments of any order, then f is Schwartz function.

Also note that the class of split trees covers several random trees appearing in context of computer science. A list of examples is given by Devroye [4, Table 1]. All examples satisfy the (first) condition of Theorem 3.7 and thus all limits in these examples admit Schwartz densities.

Finally note that Theorem 4.2 can also be applied to multivariate limit laws. As an example we discuss a bivariate limit law for split trees by Munsonius [29, Theorem 1.5]. Again let $\mathcal{T}_n$ be a random split tree storing n items and let $X_n := \Psi(\mathcal{T}_n)$. Moreover, let W_n denote the Wiener index of $\mathcal{T}_n$ (see [29]). Assume that the marginals V_j of the split vector $\mathcal{V}$ have Lebesgue densities. Then [29, Theorem 1.5]

$$\left(\frac{W_n - \mathbb{E}[W_n]}{n^2}, \frac{X_n - \mathbb{E}[X_n]}{n}\right) \xrightarrow{d} (W, X) \tag{16}$$

for some limit (W, X). This limit satisfies $\mathbb{E}[W] = \mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ and

$$\begin{pmatrix} W \\ X \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{b} \begin{pmatrix} V_j^2 & V_j(1-V_j) \\ 0 & V_j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W^{(j)} \\ X^{(j)} \end{pmatrix} + \eta(\mathcal{V}) \tag{17}$$

where $\mathcal{V}, (W^{(1)}, X^{(1)}), \dots, (W^{(b)}, X^{(b)})$ are independent; $(W^{(j)}, X^{(j)}) \stackrel{d}{=} (W, X)$; and

$$\eta(\mathcal{V}) = C(\mathcal{V}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} c\left(1 - \sum_j V_j^2\right) - 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and with $C(\mathcal{V})$ as in (13). Theorem 4.2 yields the following:

Theorem 3.8. *Let $(V_1, \dots, V_b)$ be a split vector with*

- $\mathbb{P}(\max_j V_j \geq 1 - x) \leq \lambda x^\nu$ *for some $\lambda, \nu > 0$ and all $x \geq 0$,*
- $\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_j V_j^2 = x\right) < 1$ *for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Then the limit (W, X) in (16) admits a bounded density $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Remark 3.9. *Theorem 4.2 also yields that the density f above is a Schwartz function, if $\mathbb{E}[|X|^p] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[|W|^p] < \infty$ for all $p > 0$. It is known that X has finite exponential moments [31, Theorem 5.1][2, Theorem 2.1]. We leave it as an open problem whether all moments of W are finite.*

Remark 3.10. *The second condition in Theorem 3.8 is necessary, since otherwise (X, X) is the unique solution to (17): Note that $\mathbb{E}[W] = \mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[C(\mathcal{V})] = 0$ and thus*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[c\left(1 - \sum_j V_j^2\right)\right] = 1.$$

Hence, if $\sum_j V_j^2$ has a degenerate distribution then $\eta(\mathcal{V}) = C(\mathcal{V})(1,1)^T$. Therefore if X is the solution to (15) then (X, X) is a solution to (17).

4. Main Results

Let m be a positive integer. Let $X_1, \dots, X_m$ be $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variables which solve a system of distributional equations introduced in Equation (DE) below. Assume for every $r \in [m]$ the existence of a function $\ell_r : \mathbb{N} \to [m]$, a family $(A_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}$ of random $d \times d$ matrices $A_{r,j}$, and a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable b_r such that X_r satisfies the following distributional equation:

$$X_r \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_{r,j} X^{(j)}_{\ell_r(j)} + b_r, \quad r \in [m], \tag{DE}$$

where $X^{(1)}_{\ell_r(1)}, X^{(2)}_{\ell_r(2)}, \dots$ and $((A_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}, b_r)$ are independent, and $X^{(j)}_{\ell_r(j)}$ has the same distribution as $X_{\ell_r(j)}$ for all $j \geq 1$. Note that $A_{r,1}, A_{r,2}, \dots$ neither need to be independent nor identically distributed. In particular, it is possible to set $A_{r,j} = 0$ for almost all j.

We address three questions in this section: What conditions imply the existence of a density function f_r for the distribution $\mathcal{L}(X_r)$, what can we say about the differentiability of f_r, and how fast is the function f_r (and also its derivatives) decaying at $\pm\infty$? For the last question we use the notion of Schwartz functions stated in Definition 2.1.

As a preparation for the main results we introduce some notation. Let $A^T_{r,j}$ denote the transpose of $A_{r,j}$ and

$$\alpha_{r,j} := \min_{\|t\|=1} \|A^T_{r,j} t\|, \qquad \|A^T_{r,j}\|_{\mathrm{op}} := \max_{\|t\|=1} \|A^T_{r,j} t\|, \qquad \text{for } r \in [m],\ j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{18}$$

Moreover, let $\alpha^{\max}_r \geq \alpha^{\sec}_r$ denote the two largest elements in $(\alpha_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}$. Finally, let

$$N_r(\mathcal{I}) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_{r,j} \in \mathcal{I}\} \cap \{\|A^T_{r,j}\|_{\mathrm{op}} \in \mathcal{I}\}}, \quad r \in [m],\ \mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}. \tag{19}$$

The following conditions are tailored to the examples of the previous section. More general conditions are discussed in Definition 4.3 after the main result.

Definition 4.1. Conditions (A1)-(A5) hold if for all $r \in [m]$ and $j \geq 1$:

(A1) $\mathbb{P}(\alpha^{\max}_r \geq a) = 1$ for some constant $a > 0$,

(A2) $\mathbb{P}(\alpha^{\sec}_r \leq x) \leq \lambda x^{\nu}$ for some $\lambda, \nu > 0$ and all $x > 0$,

(A3) $\mathbb{P}(\|A^T_{r,j}\|_{\mathrm{op}} \leq 1) = 1$,

(A4) $\mathrm{Supp}(X_r)$ is in general position (see Definition 2.3),

(A5) $\mathbb{P}(N_r(\mathcal{I}) \geq 1) > 0$ for $\mathcal{I} := (0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

The main result of this paper is the following theorem:

Theorem 4.2. *Conditions (A1)-(A5) imply that X_r admits a bounded density function $f_r \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $r \in [m]$. If additionally $\mathbb{E}[\|X_r\|^p] < \infty$ for all $r \in [m]$ and $p > 0$, then X_r admits a Schwartz density (see Definition 2.2).*

The proof of Theorem 4.2 is based on Fourier analysis. We only outline the proof strategy in this section. Full proofs are given in Section 5.

Note that the set of Schwartz functions is preserved under Fourier transformation [41, Theorem 7.4(d)]. Thus the characteristic function of a distribution is a Schwartz

function if and only if the distribution has a Schwartz density. For the remainder of the section we discuss conditions on (DE) and their effect on the characteristic functions

$$\phi_r(t) := \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\langle t, X_r\rangle)],\ t \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ r \in [m].$$

The first step of the proof is to verify that (A1)-(A5) imply the following conditions:

Definition 4.3. Conditions (C1)-(C3) hold if for all $r \in [m]$:

(C1) $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\max} > 0) = 1$,

(C2) $\mathbb{E}[N_r((0,1])] > 1$,

(C3) $\mathbb{P}(\langle s, X_r\rangle \in \mathbb{Z} + c) < 1$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\eta > 0$. Conditions (C4)-(C6) hold for η if for all $r \in [m]$:

(C4) $\mathbb{E}[(\alpha_r^{\text{sec}})^{-\eta} | \alpha_r^{\text{sec}} > 0] < \infty$,

(C5) $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\max} \le x) = \mathrm{O}(x^\eta)$ as $x \to 0$,

(C6) $\mathbb{E}[(\alpha_r^{\max})^{-\eta} \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_r^{\text{sec}} = 0\}}] < 1$.

Finally, let $\chi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ be a function. Condition (C7) holds for χ if for all $\beta > 0$ a constant $C_\beta > 0$ exists such that for all $x > 0$ and $r \in [m]$

$$\text{(C7)}\quad \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j\ge 1}\left((\alpha_{r,j}x)^{-\beta} \wedge 1\right)\right] \le C_\beta x^{-\chi(\beta)}.$$

Afterwards, we successively improve bounds on $|\phi_r(t)|$ as indicated in the results below. The Fourier inversion formula then yields the existence and differentiability of density functions for $X_1, \dots, X_m$.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume (C1)-(C3). Then,*

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \sup_{\|t\|=R} |\phi_r(t)| = 0 \text{ for all } r \in [m].$$

Proposition 4.5. *Assume (C1)-(C3) and (C4)-(C6) with $\eta > 0$. Then,*

$$|\phi_r(t)| = \mathrm{O}\left(\|t\|^{-\eta}\right) \text{ for all } r \in [m] \text{ as } \|t\| \to \infty. \tag{20}$$

If $\eta > 1$, then X_r admits a bounded density function $f_r \in \mathcal{C}^{\lfloor\eta\rfloor - 1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $r \in [m]$.

Note that Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.5 are based on the strategy of Liu [23], who studied (DE) with $m = 1$, $d = 1$ and $b_1 = 0$. However, in every example in Section 3, (C4) only holds for η up to some constant C. Thus Proposition 4.5 is either not sufficient to prove the existence of a density function at all (if $C \le 1$) or at least fails to prove its smoothness. The bound in Proposition 4.5 can often be improved by Proposition 4.6 below. To this end, let χ^n denote the n-fold composition of a function $\chi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ with itself.

Proposition 4.6. *Assume (C1)-(C6) and (C7) with $\eta > 0$ and $\chi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \chi^n(\eta) = \infty$. Then, for all $\beta > 0$,*

$$|\phi_r(t)| = \mathrm{O}\left(\|t\|^{-\beta}\right) \text{ for all } r \in [m] \text{ as } \|t\| \to \infty.$$

In particular, X_r admits a bounded density function $f_r \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $r \in [m]$.

This results can be extended to yield a Schwartz density as follows:

Lemma 4.7. *Let X be a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable with characteristic function ϕ. Assume $\mathbb{E}[\|X\|^p] < \infty$ for all $p > 0$. Moreover, assume for all $\beta > 0$ that*

$$|\phi(t)| = \mathrm{O}\left(\|t\|^{-\beta}\right) \text{ as } \|t\| \to \infty.$$

Then X admits a Schwartz density (see Definition 2.2).

Remark 4.8. *Rösler [40] analyzes stochastic fixed point equations for real valued random variables (i.e. $d = 1$ and $m = 1$ in (DE)) regarding exponential moments. In particular, he states [40, Theorem 6] sufficient conditions on (DE) for finite exponential moments.*

Remark 4.9. *Note that the results in this section can also be applied to $\mathbb{C}$-valued random variables by embedding them into $\mathbb{R}^2$ in the canonical way. Since some of our applications involve complex valued random variables, we briefly formalize this embedding.*

Let $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ be $\mathbb{C}$-valued random variables. Assume for every $r \in [m]$ the existence of a function $\ell_r : [k_r] \to \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{C}$-valued random variables $V_{r,1}, V_{r,2}, \dots, B_r$ such that:

$$Y_r \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} V_{r,j} Y^{(j)}_{\ell_r(j)} + B_r, \tag{21}$$

where $Y^{(1)}_{\ell_r(1)}, Y^{(2)}_{\ell_r(2)}, \dots$ and $((V_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}, B_r)$ are independent; and $Y^{(j)}_{\ell_r(j)}$ has the same distribution as $Y_{\ell_r(j)}$ for $j \geq 1$.

Then $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ can be embedded into (DE) with $d = 2$ by letting

$$X_r := \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{Re}(Y_r) \\ \mathfrak{Im}(Y_r) \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{r,j} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{Re}(V_{r,j}) & -\mathfrak{Im}(V_{r,j}) \\ \mathfrak{Im}(V_{r,j}) & \mathfrak{Re}(V_{r,j}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad b_r := \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{Re}(B_r) \\ \mathfrak{Im}(B_r) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{22}$$

Note that $\|A^T_{r,j}\|_{\mathrm{op}}$ and $\alpha_{r,j}$ in (18) are both equal to $|V_{r,j}|$.

4.1. **Applying Theorem 4.2 to the Examples.** Checking Conditions (A1)-(A5) for real valued random variables ($d = 1$) is usually straight forward and details in most examples are left to the reader.

1. Quicksort. Recall that the bivariate limit satisfies (4), that is (DE) with $m = 1$ and

$$A_{1,1} = \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-U & 0 \\ 0 & 1-U \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{1,j} = \mathbf{0},\ j \geq 3, \quad b_1 = g_2(U).$$

In particular,

$$\alpha_1^{\max} = \max\{U, 1-U\}, \qquad \alpha_1^{\mathrm{sec}} = \min\{U, 1-U\}.$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The assertion follows from Theorem 4.2 if (A1)-(A5) hold. Conditions (A1),(A2),(A3) and (A5) can be verified easily and are left to the reader. For (A4) let (x, y) be an arbitrary element of $\mathrm{Supp}((X, Y))$. Then, by (4),

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + g_2(u) : u \in [0,1] \right\} \subset \mathrm{Supp}\left(\begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

The points $(x,y)^T$, $(x,y)^T+g_2(0)$ and $(x,y)^T+g_2(1/2)$ are in general position. Therefore (A4) holds and Theorem 4.2 yields the assertion. □

2.1. Urns with Two Colors and Deterministic Replacement. In this example $m=2$. $\alpha_r^{\max}$ and $\alpha_r^{\sec}$ are the two largest elements of $(D_j^\lambda)_{j\in[K]}$, where $(D_1,\dots,D_K)$ has a Dirichlet distribution. Checking (A1)-(A5) is left to the reader. The additional integrability condition to obtain a Schwartz density holds by [3].

2.2. A Random Replacement Urn. Again $m=2$, $\alpha_r^{\max}=\max\{U^\lambda,(1-U)^\lambda\}$, $\alpha_r^{\sec}=\min\{U^\lambda,(1-U)^\lambda\}$. Checking (A1)-(A5) is left to the reader.

2.3. Cyclic Urns. Note that this examples is embedded into $\mathbb{R}^2$. However, as mentioned in Remark 4.9,

$$\alpha_{1,1}=\|A_{1,1}^T\|_{\mathrm{op}}=|U^\omega|,\quad \alpha_{1,2}=\|A_{1,2}^T\|_{\mathrm{op}}=|\omega(1-U)^\omega|$$

Thus, with $\lambda=\mathfrak{Re}(\omega)$,

$$\alpha_1^{\max}=\max\{U^\lambda,(1-U)^\lambda\},\quad \alpha_1^{\sec}=\min\{U^\lambda,(1-U)^\lambda\}.$$

In particular, Conditions (A1)-(A3) and (A5) hold as in the previous example. For Condition (A4) it remains to find three elements of $\mathrm{Supp}(X)$ that are in general position. To this end, note that $\mathbb{E}[X]\neq 0$ implies that $\mathrm{Supp}(X)\setminus\{0\}$ is not empty. Let x be an arbitrary element of $\mathrm{Supp}(X)\setminus\{0\}$. Note that(10) implies $\omega x\in\mathrm{Supp}(X)$ since $0\in\mathrm{Supp}(U)$. Thus $\mathrm{Supp}(X)$ contains the three points $x,\omega x,\omega^2 x$, which, embedded into $\mathbb{R}^2$, are in general position. Theorem 4.2 yields a density $f\in\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for $(\mathfrak{Re}(X),\mathfrak{Im}(X))$. For the finiteness of all moments see, e.g., Pouyanne [35].

3.1. Random Recursive Trees. The arguments are essentially the same as in the Quicksort example (note that $\alpha_1^{\max}$ and $\alpha_1^{\sec}$ coincide with the coefficients in Quicksort). Details are left to the reader. For the finiteness of all moments see Dobrow and Fill [6].

3.2. Split Trees. For Theorem 3.7 note that since $\sum_j V_j=1$,

$$\alpha_1^{\max}\geq 1/b,\qquad \alpha_1^{\sec}\geq(1-\alpha_1^{\max})/(b-1).$$

Hence (A1) and (A2) hold by assumption on $\max_j V_j$. Moreover, (A3) holds since $(V_1,\dots,V_b)$ is a probability vector and (A5) holds since $\mathbb{P}(\max_j V_j=1)=0$. Finally note that (15) and $\mathbb{P}(C(\mathcal{V})\neq 0)>0$ imply that X is non-degenerate and therefore (A4) holds. Theorem 4.2 yields that X admits a Schwartz density, since all moments of X are finite [2, Theorem 2.1].

It remains to check the conditions for the joint limit of path length and Wiener index:

Proof of Theorem 3.8. Recall that in this example $m=1$ and

$$A_{1,j}=\begin{pmatrix}V_j^2 & V_j(1-V_j)\\ 0 & V_j\end{pmatrix},\ j\in[b],\quad A_{1,j}=\mathbf{0},\ j>b,$$

$$b_1=\eta(\mathcal{V})=C(\mathcal{V})\begin{pmatrix}1\\1\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix}c\left(1-\sum_j V_j^2\right)-1\\ 0\end{pmatrix}.$$

As a preparation we need to compute $\|A_{r,j}^T\|_{\mathrm{op}}$ and $\alpha_{r,j} := \min_{\|t\|=1} \|A_{r,j}^T t\|$. Let

$$f_v(x) := \left\| \begin{pmatrix} v^2 & 0 \\ v(1-v) & v \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \sqrt{1-x^2} \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2, \qquad v \in [0,1], x \in [-1,1].$$

Rewriting $f_v(x) = v^2 \left[1 - 2(1-v)\left(vx^2 - x\sqrt{1-x^2}\right)\right]$ reveals that it is sufficient to maximize and minimize the function

$$x \mapsto vx^2 - x\sqrt{1-x^2}, \qquad x \in [-1,1].$$

The extreme points of this function in $(-1,1)$ are

$$x_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{1 - \frac{v}{\sqrt{1+v^2}}}, \qquad x_2 = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{1 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{1+v^2}}}.$$

Hence,

$$\max_{x\in[-1,1]} f_v(x) = v\sqrt{1 - v(1-v) + (1-v)\sqrt{1+v^2}},$$
$$\min_{x\in[-1,1]} f_v(x) = v\sqrt{1 - v(1-v) - (1-v)\sqrt{1+v^2}}$$

and therefore, for any $j \in [b]$,

$$\|A_{1,j}^T\|_{\mathrm{op}} = V_j\sqrt{1 - V_j(1-V_j) + (1-V_j)\sqrt{1+V_j^2}}$$
$$\alpha_{1,j} = V_j\sqrt{1 - V_j(1-V_j) - (1-V_j)\sqrt{1+V_j^2}}$$

In particular, using (a) $\sqrt{1+v^2} \le 1+v$ and $v(2-v) \le 1$, and (b) $\sqrt{1+v^2} \le 1+v^2$,

$$\|A_{1,j}^T\|_{\mathrm{op}} \overset{(a)}{\le} \sqrt{V_j} \le 1, \qquad \alpha_{1,j} \overset{(b)}{\ge} V_j^{5/2}.$$

With these bounds combined with the fact that $(V_1, \dots, V_b)$ is a probability vector it is not hard to check (A1)-(A3) and (A5) (cf. the previous proof for similar arguments).

It remains to show that $\mathrm{Supp}((W,X))$ is in general position. Note that in $\mathbb{R}^2$ only (subsets of) lines are not in general position. Thus $\mathrm{Supp}((W,X))$ is in general position if and only if

$$\mathbb{P}(X=0) < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(W = aX + b) < 1 \text{ for all } a, b \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We already know $\mathbb{P}(X=0) = 0$ by the previous result on the path length. Also note that $\mathbb{E}[W] = \mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ implies $\mathbb{P}(W = aX + b) < 1$ for all $b \neq 0$. Thus, it only remains to show $\mathbb{P}(W = aX) < 1$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is an $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(W = aX) = 1.$$

Then $\mathrm{Supp}((W,X)) = \{x(a,1) : x \in \mathrm{Supp}(X)\}$. However, (17) implies for any $(ax,x) \in \mathrm{Supp}((W,X))$ and any $v \in \mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{V})$ that

$$\mathrm{Supp}((W,X)) \ni \zeta(x,v) := \sum_{j=1}^{b} \begin{pmatrix} v_j^2 & v_j(1-v_j) \\ 0 & v_j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} ax \\ x \end{pmatrix} + \eta(v).$$

In particular, $\zeta(x',v) - \zeta(x,v) \in \{y(a,1) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$ for any $x, x' \in \mathrm{Supp}(X)$ and $v \in \mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{V})$, since $\{y(a,1) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is closed under subtraction. Hence

$$(x-x') \sum_{j=1}^{b} \begin{pmatrix} v_j^2 & v_j(1-v_j) \\ 0 & v_j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \{y(a,1) : y \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

which for $x \neq x'$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_j v_j^2 a + 1 - \sum_j v_j^2 = a.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(\sum_j V_j^2 < 1) = \mathbb{P}(\max_j V_j < 1) = 1$ by assumption, this implies $a = 1$. Thus we may conclude $\mathbb{P}(W = aX) < 1$ for all $a \neq 1$ and it only remains to show $\mathbb{P}(W = X) < 1$.

As before, note that if $(x,x) \in \mathrm{Supp}((W,X))$ then

$$\mathrm{Supp}((W,X)) \ni \zeta(x,v) := \sum_{j=1}^{b} \begin{pmatrix} v_j^2 & v_j(1-v_j) \\ 0 & v_j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ x \end{pmatrix} + \eta(v) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ x \end{pmatrix} + \eta(v),$$

which is only possible if $\eta(v) \in \{y(1,1) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$. However, by assumption there is a $(v_1, \ldots, v_d) \in \mathrm{Supp}(\mathcal{V})$ with

$$c \left(1 - \sum_j v_j^2 \right) - 1 \neq 0$$

and thus $\eta(v) \notin \{y(1,1) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$, a contradiction to $\mathrm{Supp}((W,X)) \subset \{y(1,1) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Thus we may conclude that $\mathrm{Supp}((W,X))$ is in general position. Theorem 4.2 yields the assertion. □

5. Proofs

This section contains the proofs of the results in Section 4. Recall $\phi_r(t) := \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\langle t, X_r\rangle)]$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$. First note that if $|\phi_r|$ is integrable with respect to the Lebesgue-measure λ^d on $\mathbb{R}^d$, then the distribution of X_r admits a bounded density function f_r given by the Fourier-inversion formula:

$$f_r(t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathrm{e}^{-i\langle x,t\rangle} \phi_r(x) \mathrm{d}\lambda^d(x). \tag{23}$$

Moreover, for any $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, a standard argument based on the Dominated Convergence Theorem reveals that the derivative $D^\beta f_r$ exists and is continuous if $x \mapsto x^\beta \phi_r(x)$ is integrable, where $x^\beta := x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots x_d^{\beta_d}$ (see the proof of Lemma 2 in [8, Section XV.4], for example). Thus, the following implication holds for any $\eta > 1$:

$$|\phi_r(t)| = \mathrm{O}\left(\|x\|^{-\eta}\right) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad X_r \text{ admits a density } f_r \in \mathcal{C}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - 1}(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{24}$$

This observation can be extended to show that the class of Schwartz functions is preserved under Fourier transformation [41, Theorem 7.4(d)]:

$$\phi_r \text{ is a Schwartz function} \iff X_r \text{ admits a Schwartz density.} \tag{25}$$

The upcoming bounds on $|\phi_r|$ are based on the following observation:

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that* (DE) *holds. Then*

$$|\phi_r(t)| \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left|\phi_{\ell_r(j)}\left(A_{r,j}^T t\right)\right|\right] \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } r \in [m].$$

Moreover, let $\psi_r(x) := \sup_{\|t\| \geq x} |\phi_r(t)|$. *Then,*

$$\psi_r(x) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \psi_{\ell_r(j)}(\alpha_{r,j} x)\right] \quad \text{for all } x \geq 0 \text{ and } r \in [m].$$

Proof. Equation (DE), Jensen's inequality and the independence in (DE) imply

$$|\phi_r(t)| \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left|\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(i\langle A_{r,j}^T t, X_{\ell_r(j)}^{(j)}\rangle)\right|(A_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}, b_r\right] \cdot \exp(i\langle t, b_r\rangle)\right|\right],$$

in which the exchange of infinite product and conditional expectation also uses the Dominated Convergence Theorem. Note that the remaining conditional expectations equal $\phi_{\ell_r(j)}(A_{r,j}^T t)$ since $X_{\ell_r(j)}^{(j)}$ and $((A_{r,j})_{j\geq 1}, b_r)$ are independent. Therefore, the first bound of the claim follows since $|\exp(i\langle t, b_r\rangle)| = 1$.

The bound on ψ_r follows from the first result and $\|A_{r,j}^T t\| \geq \alpha_{r,j} x$ for all $\|t\| \geq x$. □

The remainder of this section contains the missing proofs of Section 4. For the reader's convenience, Conditions (C1)-(C7) and all results are restated in this section.

Definition 5.2. Conditions (C1)-(C3) hold if for all $r \in [m]$:

(C1) $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\max} > 0) = 1$,

(C2) $\mathbb{E}[N_r((0,1])] > 1$,

(C3) $\mathbb{P}(\langle s, X_r\rangle \in \mathbb{Z} + c) < 1$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\eta > 0$. Conditions (C4)-(C6) hold for η if for all $r \in [m]$:

(C4) $\mathbb{E}[(\alpha_r^{\text{sec}})^{-\eta} | \alpha_r^{\text{sec}} > 0] < \infty$,

(C5) $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\max} \leq x) = \mathrm{O}(x^\eta)$ as $x \to 0$,

(C6) $\mathbb{E}[(\alpha_r^{\max})^{-\eta} \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_r^{\text{sec}} = 0\}}] < 1$.

Finally, let $\chi : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ be a function. Condition (C7) holds for χ if for all $\beta > 0$ a constant $C_\beta > 0$ exists such that for all $x > 0$ and $r \in [m]$

$$\text{(C7)} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j\geq 1}\left((\alpha_{r,j} x)^{-\beta} \wedge 1\right)\right] \leq C_\beta x^{-\chi(\beta)}.$$

Lemma 5.3. *Assume* (C1), (C2) *and* (C3). *Then,*

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \sup_{\|t\|=R} |\phi_r(t)| = 0 \text{ for all } r \in [m].$$

Proof. The proof is based on the ideas of [7, Lemma 6.2] (cf. also [23, Lemma 3.1]): Let

$$g_r : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to [0,1],\ R \mapsto \sup_{\|t\|=R} |\phi_r(t)|,\ r \in [m], \qquad g := \max_{r\in[m]} g_r.$$

Lemma 5.1 implies for any $r \in [m]$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|\phi_r(t)| \le \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left|\phi_{\ell_r(j)}\left(A_{r,j}^T t\right)\right|\right] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j\in I_r} \left|\phi_{\ell_r(j)}\left(A_{r,j}^T t\right)\right|\right] \tag{26}$$

with $I_r = \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \alpha_{r,j} > 0\}$. Note that $\|A_{r,j}^T t\| \to \infty$ for all $j \in I_r$ almost surely as $\|t\| \to \infty$. Thus, considering

$$\xi_r := \limsup_{R\to\infty} g_r(R),\ r \in [m], \qquad \xi = \max_{r\in[m]} \eta_r = \limsup_{R\to\infty} g(R),$$

this implies by the Dominated Convergence Theorem that

$$\xi_r \le \mathbb{E}\left[\xi^{|I_r|}\right] \le \mathbb{P}(|I_r| = 0) + \xi\mathbb{P}(|I_r| = 1) + \xi^2\mathbb{P}(|I_r| \ge 2).$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}(|I_r| = 0) = 0$ by condition (C1) and $\mathbb{P}(|I_r| \ge 2) > 0$ by condition (C2) and the fact that $|I_r| \ge N_r((0,1])$. Therefore, the previous bound implies $\xi \in \{0,1\}$. It remains to show $\xi < 1$ which is done by contradiction. Observe that condition (C3) implies

$$g(R) < 1 \quad \text{for all } R > 0 \tag{27}$$

because $|\phi_r(t)| = 1$ for $t \neq 0$ yields $\mathbb{E}[\exp(i\langle t, X_r\rangle)] = \exp(i\beta)$ for some $\beta \in [0, 2\pi)$ and thus $\langle t, X_r\rangle \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z} + \beta$ almost surely, contradicting (C3). Since $\{t \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|t\| = R\}$ is a compact set and $t \mapsto |\phi_r(t)|$ is continuous, one obtains (27). Now suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\xi = 1$. Fix any $R_0 > 0$. Choose $R_1^{(n)}$ and $R_2^{(n)}$ for all integers n with $1 - 1/n \ge g(R_0)$ in such a way that the following holds:

$$R_1^{(n)} \le R_0 \le R_2^{(n)}, \quad g\left(R_1^{(n)}\right) = g\left(R_2^{(n)}\right) = 1 - \frac{1}{n}, \quad g(R) \le 1 - \frac{1}{n} \text{ for } R \in \left[R_1^{(n)}, R_2^{(n)}\right].$$

This is possible since g is continuous and $g(0) = \xi = 1$ by assumption. Note that $(R_1^{(n)})_n$ is a non-increasing sequence with lower bound 0. Thus $R_1^{(n)}$ converges to a limit R_1^*. However, the continuity of g implies $g(R_1^*) = \lim_{n\to\infty} g(R_1^{(n)}) = 1$ and therefore $R_1^* = 0$ by (27). Moreover, the sequence $(R_2^{(n)})_n$ is bounded from below by R_0 and thus it cannot be convergent since this would contradict (27) and the continuity of g. Therefore, $R_2^{(n)} \to \infty$ since $(R_2^{(n)})_n$ is non-decreasing. Hence, the sequences satisfy, as $n \to \infty$,

$$R_1^{(n)} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad R_2^{(n)} \to \infty. \tag{28}$$

Now let t_n and r_n be chosen in such a way that $\|t_n\| = R_2^{(n)}$ and $g(R_2^{(n)}) = |\phi_{r_n}(t_n)|$. Then, by Lemma 5.1,

$$1 - \frac{1}{n} = |\phi_{r_n}(t_n)| \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left|\phi_{\ell_{r_n}(j)}\left(A_{r_n,j}^T t_n\right)\right|\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{N_{r_n}^{(n)}}\right] \tag{29}$$

with $N_r^{(n)} = \sum_{j\geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_{r,j} \geq R_1^{(n)}/R_2^{(n)}\} \cap \{\|A_{r,j}^T\|_{\mathrm{op}} \leq 1\}}$ for $r \in [m]$. Since $N_r^{(n)} \uparrow N_r((0,1])$, condition (C2) implies $\mathbb{E}[N_r^{(n)}] > 1$ for all sufficiently large n. However, this contradicts (29) for large n since, for any fixed $c \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{N_{r_n}^{(n)}}\right] \leq 1 - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{c} j\mathbb{P}(N_{r_n}^{(n)} = j) + \mathrm{O}\left(n^{-2}\right)$$

in which the sum on the right-hand side is greater than 1 for sufficiently large c and all sufficiently large n. Hence, $\xi = 0$ holds as claimed. □

Proposition 5.4. *Assume (C1)-(C6) with $\eta > 0$. Then,*

$$|\phi_r(t)| = \mathrm{O}\left(\|t\|^{-\eta}\right) \text{ for all } r \in [m] \text{ as } \|t\| \to \infty.$$

If $\eta > 1$, then X_r admits a bounded density function $f_r \in \mathcal{C}^{\lfloor \eta \rfloor - 1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $r \in [m]$.

Proof. Let $\psi_r(x) = \sup_{\|t\|\geq x} |\phi_r(t)|$ and $\psi = \max_{r\in[m]} \psi_r$. Recall that Lemma 5.1 yields for $x \geq 0$ and $r \in [m]$

$$\psi_r(x) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \psi_{\ell_r(j)}(\alpha_{r,j}x)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\alpha_r^{\max}x)\psi(\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}x)\right]. \tag{30}$$

Lemma 5.3 implies for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the existence of a constant $x_0 = x_0(\varepsilon)$ such that $\psi(x) \leq \varepsilon$ for $x \geq x_0$. Thus, (30) yields

$$\psi_r(x) \leq \mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\max} \leq x_0/x) + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}x)\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}>0\}}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\alpha_r^{\max}x)\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}=0\}}\right].$$

Let $r(x) = \arg\max_{r\in[m]} \mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\alpha_r^{\max}x)\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}=0\}}\right]$ and $s(x) = \arg\max_{s\in[m]} \mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\alpha_s^{\mathrm{sec}}x)\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_s^{\mathrm{sec}}>0\}}\right]$. Then, the previous bound and condition (C5) imply the existence of a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\psi(x) \leq C\left(\frac{x_0}{x}\right)^{\eta} + \mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\alpha_{r(x)}^{\max}x)\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_{r(x)}^{\mathrm{sec}}=0\}}\right] + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\alpha_{s(x)}^{\mathrm{sec}}x)\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_{s(x)}^{\mathrm{sec}}>0\}}\right], \quad x > 0. \tag{31}$$

By assumption (C4) and (C6) there are constants $c_1 \in (0,1)$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(\alpha_r^{\max})^{-\eta}\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}=0\}}\right] \leq c_1, \qquad \mathbb{E}\left[(\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}})^{-\eta}\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}>0\}}\right] \leq c_2, \quad \text{for all } r \in [m]. \tag{32}$$

Moreover, (C2) implies the existence of another constant $p < 1$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}} = 0) \leq p$ for all $r \in [m]$. Hence, Equation (31) and the trivial upper bound $\psi \leq 1$ yield

$$\psi(x) \leq C\left(\frac{x_0}{x}\right)^{\eta} + p + \varepsilon, \quad x > 0.$$

Furthermore, Equations (31) and (32) imply by induction on n that

$$\psi(x) \le C \left(\frac{x_0}{x}\right)^{\eta} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (c_1 + c_2\varepsilon)^j + (p+\varepsilon)^n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Any choice $\varepsilon < \min(1-p, (1-c_1)/c_2)$ yields the assertion by letting $n \to \infty$. The existence of a density function and its derivatives up to order $\lfloor \eta \rfloor - 1$ follows, as already noted in (24). □

Proposition 5.5. *Assume (C1)-(C6) and (C7) with η and χ such that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \chi^n(\eta) = \infty$. Then, for all $\beta > 0$,*

$$|\phi_r(t)| = \mathrm{O}\left(\|t\|^{-\beta}\right) \text{ for all } r \in [m] \text{ as } \|t\| \to \infty.$$

In particular, X_r admits a bounded density $f_r \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $r \in [m]$.

Proof. The bound on $|\phi_r(t)|$ follows from Theorem 5.4 and Lemma 5.6 below. The second part holds by (24). □

Lemma 5.6. *Assume (C7) and that $|\phi_r(t)| = \mathrm{O}(\|t\|^{-\eta})$ for some $\eta > 0$ and all $r \in [m]$. Then, for all $\beta < \limsup_{n\to\infty} \chi^n(\eta)$,*

$$|\phi_r(t)| = \mathrm{O}\left(\|t\|^{-\beta}\right) \text{ for all } r \in [m] \text{ as } \|t\| \to \infty.$$

Proof. Let $\psi_r(x) = \sup_{\|t\|\ge x} |\phi_r(t)|$ for $r \in [m]$. By assumption there is a constant $K_\eta > 0$ such that $\psi_r(x) \le K_\eta x^{-\eta} \wedge 1$. This implies in combination with (C7) and Lemma 5.1 that $\psi_r(x) \le K_{\chi(\eta)} x^{-\chi(\eta)}$ with $K_{\chi(\eta)} := C_\eta K_\eta^{\chi(\eta)/\eta}$. Iterating this bound yields the assertion. □

Lemma 5.7. *Let X be a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable with characteristic function ϕ. Assume $\mathbb{E}[\|X\|^p] < \infty$ for all $p > 0$. Moreover, assume for all $\beta > 0$ that*

$$|\phi(t)| = \mathrm{O}\left(\|t\|^{-\beta}\right) \text{ as } \|t\| \to \infty. \tag{33}$$

Then X admits a Schwartz density (see Definition 2.2).

Proof. The proof is a straight forward generalization of well known arguments for $d = 1$, see, e.g., Fill and Janson for Quicksort [9]. First recall that the class of Schwartz functions is preserved under Fourier transformation (25). Thus, it is sufficient to show that ϕ is a Schwartz function. Note that for all $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$

$$\left| \frac{\partial^{\beta_1}}{\partial t^{\beta_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\beta_d}}{\partial t^{\beta_d}} \exp\left(i\langle t, X\rangle\right) \right| \le \|X\|^{\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_d} \tag{34}$$

A standard argument based on the Dominated Convergence Theorem reveals that $D^\beta \phi$ exists and is given by

$$D^\beta \phi(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\partial^{\beta_1}}{\partial t^{\beta_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\beta_d}}{\partial t^{\beta_d}} \exp\left(i\langle t, X\rangle\right) \right]. \tag{35}$$

In remains to find constants $d_{\alpha,\beta} > 0$ for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ such that for all $t \neq 0$

$$|D^\beta \phi(t)| \leq d_{\alpha,\beta}(\|t\|)^{-\alpha}. \tag{36}$$

Equations (34) and (35) imply that (36) holds for $d_{0,\beta} = \mathbb{E}[\|X\|^{\beta_1+\cdots+\beta_d}]$ if $\alpha = 0$. Moreover, (33) implies the existence of constants $d_{\alpha,\mathbf{0}}$ such that (36) holds if $\beta = \mathbf{0} := (0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. As in [9, Theorem 2.9] the remaining cases follow from these cases and the next calculus lemma which is a straight-forward generalization of the corresponding lemma by Fill and Janson [9, Lemma 2.10]. □

Lemma 5.8. *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function such that the partial derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} g$ and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_j^2} g$ exist for $j \in [d]$. Assume that $|g(t)| \leq a\|t\|^{-p}$ and $|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t_j^2} g(t)| \leq b$ for some constants $a, b > 0$ and all $t \neq 0$. Then $|\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} g(t)| \leq 2\sqrt{ab}\|t\|^{-p/2}$.*

Proof. We present the full proof to keep the paper self-contained, although we only need to make minor adjustments to the proof of Fill and Janson [9, Lemma 2.10].

Fix $t = (t_1, \dots, t_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and $j \in [d]$. Let $h(x) := g(t_1, \dots, t_{j-1}, x, t_{j+1}, \dots, t_d)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. First consider the case $t_j \geq 0$: Note that for any $y > t_j$

$$\left| \int_{t_j}^{y} h'(x) \mathrm{d}x \right| = |h(y) - h(t_j)| \leq |h(y)| + |h(t_j)| \leq 2a\|t\|^{-p}, \tag{37}$$

in which the last inequality holds by assumption and by $y > t_j \geq 0$.

On the other hand, observe that for $\theta = \arg(h'(t_j))$ and every $x > t_j$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{Re}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-i\theta} h'(x)\right) &= \mathfrak{Re}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-i\theta} h'(t_j)\right) - \mathfrak{Re}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-i\theta}(h'(t_j) - h'(x))\right) \\ &\geq |h'(t_j)| - b(x - t_j), \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

in which the last inequality holds by the choice of θ, the Mean Values Theorem, and by the bound $|h''| \leq b$. Thus, for any $y > t_j$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{t_j}^{y} h'(x) \mathrm{d}x \right| &= \left| \int_{t_j}^{y} \mathrm{e}^{-i\theta} h'(x) \mathrm{d}x \right| \\ &\geq \int_{t_j}^{y} |h'(t_j)| - b(x - t_j) \mathrm{d}x \\ &= (y - t_j)|h'(t_j)| - \frac{b}{2}(y - t_j)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (37) and the choice $y := t_j + |h'(t_j)|/b$, this implies $|h'(t_j)| \leq 2\sqrt{ab}\|t\|^{-p/2}$ as claimed. For $t_j < 0$ consider $\tilde{h}(x) := h(-x)$ instead and apply the same bounds. □

Finally Proposition 5.5 and Lemma 5.7 imply the main theorem:

Proof of Theorem 4.2. By Proposition 5.5 and Lemma 5.7 it is sufficient to prove (C1)-(C7) with parameters $\eta > 0$ and $\chi : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \chi^n(\eta) = \infty.$$

Recall the assumptions (A1)-(A5), that is for all $r \in [m]$ and $j \geq 1$:

(A1) $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\max} \geq a) = 1$ for some constant $a > 0$,

(A2) $\mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\text{sec}} \leq x) \leq \lambda x^\nu$ for some $\lambda, \nu > 0$ and all $x > 0$,

(A3) $\mathbb{P}(\|A_{r,j}^T\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1) = 1$,

(A4) $\text{Supp}(X_r)$ is in general position (see Definition 2.3),

(A5) $\mathbb{P}(N_r(\mathcal{I}) \geq 1) > 0$ for $\mathcal{I} := (0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Note that (A2) in particular implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\alpha_r^{\text{sec}} > 0) = 1, \quad r \in [m]. \tag{39}$$

Condition (C1) holds by (A1). Moreover, (A3) an (39) imply $\mathbb{P}(N_r((0,1]) \geq 2) = 1$ and thus (C2).

For Condition (C3) recall that ϕ_r denotes the characteristic function of X_r. Note that $\mathbb{P}(\langle s, X_r\rangle \in \mathbb{Z} + c) = 1$ implies $|\phi_r(2\pi s)| = 1$. Hence, it is sufficient to show

$$|\phi_r(t)| < 1 \quad \text{for all } t \neq \mathbf{0}. \tag{40}$$

First note that (A4) implies the existence of $\varepsilon_r > 0$ such that

$$|\phi_r(t)| < 1 \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ with } 0 < \|t\| < \varepsilon_r. \tag{41}$$

Details on how (A4) implies (41) are stated after the proof (see Lemma 5.9). Now let

$$g_r(x) := \sup_{t:\|t\|=x} |\phi_r(t)|, \qquad g(x) := \max_{r\in[m]} g_r(x), \quad x > 0.$$

and note that the continuity of ϕ_r implies that $g_r(x) = |\phi_r(t_{r,x})|$ for some $t_{r,x}$ with $\|t_{r,x}\| = x$. In particular, by (41),

$$g(x) < 1 \text{ for } x \in (0, \varepsilon), \quad \varepsilon := \min_{r\in[m]} \varepsilon_r.$$

Now suppose (40) is false for some $r \in [m]$. Then $g(x) = 1$ for some $x \geq \varepsilon$. Since g is continuous, there is an $x_0 \geq \varepsilon$ such that

$$g(x_0) = 1, \qquad g(x) < 0 \text{ for all } x \in (0, x_0).$$

Now choose $r_0 \in [m]$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|t_0\| = x_0$, such that $g(x_0) = |\phi_{r_0}(t_0)|$. Then, by Lemma 5.1,

$$1 = |\phi_{r_0}(t_0)| \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left|\phi_{\ell_{r_0}(j)}\left(A_{r_0,j}^T t_0\right)\right|\right].$$

Hence,

$$\left|\phi_{\ell_{r_0}(j)}\left(A_{r_0,j}^T t_0\right)\right| = 1 \text{ a.s. for all } j \geq 1,$$

which requires $\|A_{r_0,j}^T t_0\| \notin (0, x_0)$. However, this contradicts (A5) since

$$\alpha_{r_0,j} x_0 \leq \|A_{r_0,j}^T t_0\| \leq \|A_{r_0,j}^T\|_{\text{op}} x_0.$$

Thus $g(x) < 1$ for all $x > 0$, which yields (C3).

Conditions (C4) and (C5) follow from (A1). Condition (C6) holds by (39). For Condition (C7) note that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty}\left(\alpha_{r,j}^{-\beta}x^{-\beta}\wedge 1\right)\right] \overset{(A1)}{\leq} a^{-\beta}x^{-\beta}\mathbb{E}[(\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}x)^{-\beta}\wedge 1]$$
$$= a^{-\beta}x^{-\beta}\left(x^{-\beta/2}+\mathbb{P}\left(\alpha_r^{\mathrm{sec}}\leq x^{-1/2}\right)\right),$$

which yields (C7) for $\chi(\beta) := \beta + (\beta\wedge\nu)/2$ by (A2). In particular, $\chi^n(\eta)\to\infty$ for any $\eta>0$ as $n\to\infty$. Therefore Proposition 4.6 yields the existence of bounded densities $f_1,\dots,f_m\in\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and Lemma 4.7 implies that f_r is a Schwartz function if all moments of X_r exist. □

We end the proof section with the missing lemma for (C3). This lemma is a generalization of a standard result for real-valued random variables [8, XV.1 Lemma 4]:

Lemma 5.9. *Let X be a $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued random variable with characteristic function ϕ. Let $\mathcal{S}_1^d := \{v\in\mathbb{R}^d : \|v\|=1\}$. Assume that* Supp$(X)$ *is in general position. Then there is an $\varepsilon>0$ such that*

$$|\phi(c\alpha)|<1 \quad \text{for all } \alpha\in\mathcal{S}_1^d,\ c\in(0,\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contraction that there is a sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n\geq1}$ in $\mathcal{S}_1^d$ and a sequence $(c_n)_{n\geq1}$ in $(0,\infty)$ such that

$$(a)\quad |\phi(c_n\alpha_n)|=1 \text{ for all } n\in\mathbb{N}, \qquad (b)\quad \lim_{n\to\infty}c_n=0.$$

First note that (a) implies that $\phi(c_n\alpha_n)=\exp(i\theta_n)$ for some $\theta_n\in[0,2\pi)$ and therefore

$$c_n\langle\alpha_n,X\rangle\in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}+\theta_n \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{42}$$

Now let $x_0,\dots,x_d\in$ Supp(X) be points in general position. Since $x_1-x_0,\dots,x_d-x_0$ is a basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$, every $\alpha\in\mathcal{S}_1^d$ has a $j\in[d]$ such that $\langle\alpha,x_j-x_0\rangle\neq0$. In particular, there is a $j\in[d]$ such that $\langle\alpha_n,x_j-x_0\rangle\neq0$ for infinitely many n. Now let $(n_k)_{k\geq1}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{N}$ with $n_k\to\infty$ such that $\langle\alpha_{n_k},x_j-x_0\rangle\neq0$ for all $k\geq1$. Then, by (42),

$$|\langle\alpha_{n_k},x_j-x_0\rangle|\geq 2\pi c_{n_k}^{-1}\longrightarrow\infty \quad \text{as } k\to\infty,$$

which is a contradiction to $|\langle\alpha_{n_k},x_j-x_0\rangle|\leq\|\alpha_{n_k}\|\|x_j-x_0\|$ and $\|\alpha_{n_k}\|=1$. □

6. Conclusion

Let X be a solution to a stochastic fixed point equation $\mu=T(\mu)$. We derived sufficient conditions on T that imply that X admits an infinitely differentiable density. If additionally all moments of X are finite, then this density is a Schwartz function. We focused on the existence of a (bounded) density for X, since this result is essential to transfer distances from a rather abstract metric that arises in the contraction method (Wasserstein metric) to the more meaningful distance of distributional functions.

It remains an interesting open problem to derive other characteristics of $\mathcal{L}(X)$ from its fixed point equation. In particular bounds on $\mathbb{P}(X\geq x)$ and $\mathbb{P}(X\leq -x)$ for (large) $x>0$ are desirable. With Rösler's approach [40, Theorem] it is possible (at least for a single stochastic fixed point equation of real valued random variables) to obtain

$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda X)] < \infty$ for all λ in some neighborhood of 0. However, at least for Quicksort it is known that the tails of the distribution decay faster than exponentially:

Let X be the Quicksort limit in (3). Knessl and Szpankowski [18] have found with non-rigorous methods (based on several unproven assumptions) some constants $c_1, x_2, \gamma > 0$ such that, as $x \to \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \le -x) \sim c_1 \exp\left(-c_2 \exp(\gamma x)\right), \qquad \mathbb{P}(X \ge x) = \exp\left(-x \ln x - x \ln\ln x + \mathrm{O}(x)\right).$$

Janson [14] showed $\mathbb{P}(X \le -x) \le \exp(-x^2/5)$ and $\mathbb{P}(X \ge x) \le \exp(-x \ln x + (1+\ln 2)x)$ rigorously for all sufficiently large x.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks Ralph Neininger and Henning Sulzbach for valuable comments on the topic and related literature.

References

[1] Krishna B. Athreya. On the supercritical one dimensional age dependent branching processes. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 40:743–763, 1969.

[2] Nicolas Broutin and Cecilia Holmgren. The total path length of split trees. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 22(5):1745–1777, 2012.

[3] Brigitte Chauvin, Cécile Mailler, and Nicolas Pouyanne. Smoothing equations for large Pólya urns. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 28(3):923–957, 2015.

[4] Luc Devroye. Universal limit laws for depths in random trees. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(2):409–432, 1999.

[5] Luc Devroye and Ralph Neininger. Density approximation and exact simulation of random variables that are solutions of fixed-point equations. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 34(2):441–468, 2002.

[6] Robert P. Dobrow and James Allen Fill. Total path length for random recursive trees. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 8(4):317–333, 1999. Random graphs and combinatorial structures (Oberwolfach, 1997).

[7] R. A. Doney. A limit theorem for a class of supercritical branching processes. *J. Appl. Probability*, 9:707–724, 1972. ISSN 0021-9002.

[8] William Feller. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. II.* Second edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, 1971.

[9] James Allen Fill and Svante Janson. Smoothness and decay properties of the limiting Quicksort density function. In *Mathematics and computer science (Versailles, 2000)*, Trends Math., pages 53–64. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.

[10] Philippe Flajolet, Joaquim Gabarró, and Helmut Pekari. Analytic urns. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(3):1200–1233, 2005.

[11] C. A. R. Hoare. Quicksort. *Comput. J.*, 5:10–15, 1962.

[12] Svante Janson. Limit theorems for certain branching random walks on compact groups and homogeneous spaces. *Ann. Probab.*, 11(4):909–930, 1983.

[13] Svante Janson. Functional limit theorems for multitype branching processes and generalized Pólya urns. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 110(2):177–245, 2004.

[14] Svante Janson. On the tails of the limiting Quicksort distribution. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 20:no. 81, 7, 2015.

[15] Norman L. Johnson and Samuel Kotz. *Urn models and their application*. John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 1977. An approach to modern discrete probability theory, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

[16] H. Kesten and B. P. Stigum. A limit theorem for multidimensional Galton-Watson processes. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 37:1211–1223, 1966.

[17] Margarete Knape and Ralph Neininger. Pólya urns via the contraction method. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 23(6):1148–1186, 2014.

[18] Charles Knessl and Wojciech Szpankowski. Quicksort algorithm again revisited. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 3(2):43–64 (electronic), 1999.

[19] M. Kuba and H. Sulzbach. On martingale tail sums in affine two-color urn models with multiple drawings. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2015.

[20] Kevin Leckey and Ralph Neininger. Asymptotic analysis of Hoppe trees. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 50(1):228–238, 2013.

[21] Kevin Leckey, Ralph Neininger, and Wojciech Szpankowski. Towards more realistic probabilistic models for data structures: the external path length in tries under the Markov model. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 877–886. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2012.

[22] Quansheng Liu. Asymptotic properties of supercritical age-dependent branching processes and homogeneous branching random walks. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 82 (1):61–87, 1999.

[23] Quansheng Liu. Asymptotic properties and absolute continuity of laws stable by random weighted mean. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 95(1):83–107, 2001.

[24] Hosam M. Mahmoud. Limiting distributions for path lengths in recursive trees. *Probab. Engrg. Inform. Sci.*, 5(1):53–59, 1991.

[25] Hosam M. Mahmoud. *Pólya urn models*. Texts in Statistical Science Series. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2009. ISBN 978-1-4200-5983-0.

[26] C. Mailler. Describing the asymptotic behaviour of multicolour Pólya urns via smoothing systems analysis. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2014.

[27] N. S. Müller. Central Limit Theorem Analogues for Multicolour Urn Models. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2016.

[28] N. S. Müller and R. Neininger. The clt analogue for cyclic urns. In *2016 Proceedings of the Twelfth Workshop on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics (ANALCO)*, pages 121–127. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2016.

[29] Götz Olaf Munsonius. On the asymptotic internal path length and the asymptotic Wiener index of random split trees. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 16:no. 35, 1020–1047, 2011.

[30] Ralph Neininger. On a multivariate contraction method for random recursive structures with applications to Quicksort. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 19(3-4):498–524, 2001. Analysis of algorithms (Krynica Morska, 2000).

[31] Ralph Neininger and Ludger Rüschendorf. On the internal path length of d-dimensional quad trees. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 15(1):25–41, 1999.

[32] Ralph Neininger and Ludger Rüschendorf. A general limit theorem for recursive algorithms and combinatorial structures. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 14(1):378–418, 2004.

[33] Ralph Neininger and Henning Sulzbach. On a functional contraction method. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(4):1777–1822, 2015.

[34] Nicolas Pouyanne. Classification of large Pólya-Eggenberger urns with regard to their asymptotics. In *2005 International Conference on Analysis of Algorithms*, Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. Proc., AD, pages 275–285 (electronic). Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., Nancy, 2005.

[35] Nicolas Pouyanne. An algebraic approach to Pólya processes. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 44(2):293–323, 2008.

[36] S. T. Rachev and L. Rüschendorf. Probability metrics and recursive algorithms. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 27(3):770–799, 1995.

[37] Mireille Régnier. A limiting distribution for quicksort. *RAIRO Inform. Théor. Appl.*, 23(3):335–343, 1989.

[38] U. Rösler. On the analysis of stochastic divide and conquer algorithms. *Algorithmica*, 29(1-2):238–261, 2001. Average-case analysis of algorithms (Princeton, NJ, 1998).

[39] Uwe Rösler. A limit theorem for "Quicksort". *RAIRO Inform. Théor. Appl.*, 25(1): 85–100, 1991.

[40] Uwe Rösler. A fixed point theorem for distributions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 42 (2):195–214, 1992.

[41] Walter Rudin. *Functional analysis*. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, second edition, 1991.

[42] Robert T. Smythe and Hosam M. Mahmoud. A survey of recursive trees. *Theo. Probab. Math. Statist.*, (51):1–27, 1995.

[43] Kok Hooi Tan and Petros Hadjicostas. Some properties of a limiting distribution in Quicksort. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 25(1):87–94, 1995.